

## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P O Box 1450 Alexandria, Virgiria 22313-1450 www.uspio.gov

PAPER

08/26/2008

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/829,171	04/09/2001	George M. Brookner	26978A-006610US	9225
77196 Townsend and	7590 08/26/200 Townsend and Crew L	EXAM	EXAMINER	
Two Embarcar	dero Center	ROBINSON BOYCE, AKIBA K		
San Francisco,	CA 94111-3834		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3628	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE

## Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
09/829,171	BROOKNER ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
AKIBA K. ROBINSON BOYCE	3628	

	ANIBATIC ROBINGON BOTOL	0020	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 18 August 2008 FAILS TO PLACE THIS AI	PPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR	ALLOWANCE.	
<ol> <li>\( \) The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appe for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C</li> </ol>	the same day as filing a Notice of A replies: (1) an amendment, affidavited (with appeal fee) in compliance	Appeal. To avoid abar t, or other evidence, v with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
periods:	T IV 1.114. The reply most be med	within one of the follow	virig time
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing	date of the final rejection.		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing	date of the final rejection	in.
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or ( MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(		FIRST REPLY WAS FI	ED MITHIN TWO
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of ext under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the self of the in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1: ension and the corresponding amount of chortened statutory period for reply origing than three months after the mailing date	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Office	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as
NOTICE OF APPEAL		TI 1 101 1 1 11	
<ol> <li>The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed w</li> </ol>	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
AMENDMENTS			
<ol> <li>The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, t</li> </ol>			cause
(a) They raise new issues that would require further cor		E below);	
(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo			
<ul><li>(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in bet appeal; and/or</li></ul>	ter form for appeal by materially rec	lucing or simplifying t	ne issues for
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a	corresponding number of finally reje	cted claims	
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	sorroopenang namber of imany reje	otou olaliilo.	
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12	21 See attached Notice of Non-Cor	mnliant Amendment (	PTOL-324)
<ol> <li>Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):</li> </ol>		inplicant / unonamone (	102 02-1/.
Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all		imely filed amendmen	t canceling the
non-allowable claim(s).	owabie ii dabiiilled iii a deparate, t	initing filed differialites	it our rooming the
7. X For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a)	will not be entered, or b) uil	be entered and an e	xplanation of
how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov	rided below or appended.		
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:			
Claim(s) allowed:			
Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: <u>1,3,5,9,10,12-16,19,20 and 24-38</u> .			
Claim(s) rejected: 1,5,5,5,70,7270,73,20 and 24-50.  Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and</li> </ol>			
was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).			
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary</li> </ol>	vercome all rejections under appea	l and/or appellant fail	s to provide a
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation</li> </ol>	n of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attach	ed.
REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER			
<ol> <li>The request for reconsideration has been considered bu See Continuation Sheet.</li> </ol>	t does NO1 place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:
<ol> <li>Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).</li> </ol>	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s).		
13. Other:			

/Akiba K Robinson-Boyce/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3628 Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: applicant argues that Diffilipp falls to teach a present location. However, in Fig. 3, and col., 7, line 68-Col. 8, line 45, Diffilippo shows that upon power up, 2p code information is checked, the postage meter requests zip code data for portable vault/printhead module, and the data center ultimately downloads the appropriate zip code data to base microprocessor. In this case, the zip code represents the present location. Applicant also argues that prior art fails to teach issuing a license for a postal device outside a region to which it is normally restricted. However, the combination of Diffilippo and Eddy discloses this limitation. Specifically Eddy discloses an electronic postage meter installation and location movement system that incorporates licensing requirements into determining the physical location of the electronic postage in a metering system as shown in col. 10, lines 58-87.